2.1. The Literature Review

A review of the literature is an essential part of academic research project. The literature review is an account of what has been published on a topic by accredited scholars and researchers. As the literature review, the writer used studies from previous researchers who also have interest in the same focus of illocutionary acts.


Isanna A. Muskananfola made a study in 2009 to know the classifications of Illocutionary Acts occurring the utterances in the speeches of Barrack Obama, the frequency occurred of each classification in the speeches. She compares both speeches of Barack Obama’s Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech. In analyzing Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech, she used Austin's theory of Speech Acts and Illocutionary Acts of Searle (1976). In analyzing the data, she used descriptive qualitative method on Illocutionary Acts of speeches delivered by Barrack Obama, Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech. She formed two research questions to describe Obama’s utterances and his action beyond in it Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech, which are:
1. What are the classifications of Illocutionary Acts occurring among the utterances in the “Victory Speech” and “Inaugural Speech” of Obama?

2. What is the frequency occurred of each classifications of Illocutionary Acts found in those speeches?

Her findings showed the five classifications of Illocutionary Acts with different frequencies used in both speeches. It was revealed that every classification occurred in Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech. They are Representative (31.75%; 52.78%), Declarations (21.95%; 6.48%), Commissives (18.29%; 16.67%), Expressives (14.63%; 6.48%), and Directives (13.42%; 17.59%). It was discovered that Obama in his speeches used several illocutionary acts of each classification to transmit his message to the audiences, mainly in the way to assert the fact, tell his beliefs, promise some future actions, invite the audiences, and declare something.

This study has some similarities with Isana’s study. The first similarity is that both used the theory of illocutionary acts by Searle to analyze the data. The second one is that both used the political speech as the object of the study. The third is that both counted the frequency of the most frequent illocutionary acts used. The last is that both used descriptive qualitative method in analyzing the data.

However, this study has significant difference from Isanna’s study. The difference is that Isanna used the speeches of Barack Obama’s Victory Speech and Inaugural Speech as the object, while this study used the speeches of Joko Widodo as the object of study.

Isanna’s research inspires the writer in using descriptive qualitative method for her own research. Moreover, Isanna’s conclusion influences the writer in the way she drags a conclusion. The writer also wanted to come out with the conclusion that gives new thought in dealing with the study of illocutionary acts.
2.1.2. A Study of The Illocutionary Acts in The Political Speech "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther King Jr.: (Marietta Belinda Rianto, 2006)

Marietta Belinda Rianto made a study in 2006 and focused on the application of the illocutionary acts in the speech text. The theories used to proceed the research are Austin’s (1962) theory of speech acts, Searle’s (1976) classification of the illocutionary act, Matthei’s (1985) theory of the production of speech, and the political speech theories from Beard (2000). In analyzing the data, she used descriptive method to describe the application of the types of illocutionary acts in each sentence in the speech. She formed two research questions to have better understanding about illocutionary acts and its application in the political speech, which are:

1. What types of illocutionary acts are found in the speech "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther King, Jr.?

2. What type of illocutionary acts has the highest number of occurrence in the speech "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther King, Jr.?

She generated two problem statements; to find the types of illocutionary acts that exist in the speech text and to find the most frequent types. Therefore, the writer's analysis resulted in the findings of all types of illocutionary act in the speech text and the representatives (46.75%) type as the most frequent type.

This study has some similarities with Marietta’s study. The first similarity is that both used the theory of illocutionary acts by Searle to analyze the data. The second one is that both used the theory of political speech by Beard (2000) as the object of the study. However, this study has clear difference from Marietta’s study. The difference is that Marietta used a speech "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther
King, Jr. as the object, while this study used the speeches of Joko Widodo as the object of study.

Marietta’s research inspires the writer in using descriptive qualitative method for her own research. Moreover, Marietta’s conclusion influences the writer in the way she drags a conclusion. The writer also wanted to come out with the conclusion that gives new thought in dealing with the study of illocutionary acts.

2.1.3. Illocutionary Acts of The Persuasion used by The Main Characters in "Runaway Jury": (Irvan Hadinata, 2008)

Irvan made a study in 2008 to investigate the speech of persuasion in a movie entitled “Runaway Jury”. He used the theory of speech act from Searle. He did his study to find the types and percentages of illocutionary acts occur in the movie. In this research, the writer used both descriptive qualitative and quantitative approach.

The writer divided into three steps in method of data collection. The first step, the writer watched the movie for several times, in order to really understand the story. Second, the writer searched and found the Runaway Jury script from the internet (http://www.script-o-rama.com/movie_script/r/runaway-jury-script-transcript-grisham.html). The third step, the writer focused only on the conversation between the main characters which contain persuasion on it. Then, he starts to categorize and analyze the data based on the concept of persuasion and illocutionary acts. He formed two research questions to describe the chunk of speech in “Runaway Jury” in terms of illocutionary acts, which are:

1. Which type of illocutionary acts mostly occurs during the process of persuasion in “Runaway Jury”?
2. What is the frequency of the illocutionary acts in the process of persuasion which occur in the movie?

Based on the data analysis, Irvan found that persuasion of the main characters take the function of illocutionary acts in the movie. In this research, Commisives (49%) is the most dominant type used by the characters on the Runaway Jury movie. Next, is Representatives (29%) and the last one is Directives (29%). Last, Irvan found that the types of illocutionary which mostly occur in the movie is assuring, stating, and advising. From the findings above, Irvan concluded that illocutionary acts is an important tool as in humans interaction because when people say something, it convey a force.

Doing the research concerning the illocutionary acts, this study has a similarity with Irvan’s study. The similarity is that both used the theory of illocutionary acts from Searle to analyze the data. The same theory from Searle which consist of Representative, Directive, Commisives, Expressive and Declarative is used in both studies. However, this study has significant difference from Irvan’s study. The difference is that Irvan used a movie entitled “Runaway Jury” as the object, while this study used the speech of Joko Widodo as the object of study.

Irvan’s research inspires the writer in using descriptive qualitative method for her own research. Moreover, Irvan’s conclusion influences the writer in the way he drags a conclusion. The writer also wanted to come out with the conclusion that gives new thought in dealing with the study of illocutionary acts.
2.2. Review of Related Theories

This study related some theories that she considers relevant to her research. The main theories used are the speech acts and the illocutionary acts. Meanwhile, the others, which are considered as supporting theories, are types and characteristics of each type of speech and political speech.

2.2.1. Speech Acts

Speech acts is the use of language to do things. Through language we are not only say something but also do things. The term speech acts is related to the theory which was originally proposed by J. L. Austin within the framework of ordinary language philosophy. For Austin, what the speaker is doing is creating social realities within certain social contexts. For example, using an explicit performative, to say “I now pronounce you man and wife” in the context of a wedding, in which one is marrying two people, is to create a social reality, i.e. in this case a married couple.

Austin's work was systematized and further developed by J. R. Searle (1969), an American philosopher, who, in relation to speech acts, claims that all linguistic communication involves linguistic acts. The unit of linguistic communication is not, as has generally been supposed, the symbol, word or sentence ...but rather the production of the symbol or word or sentence in the performance of the speech acts. Whenever we talk or write to each other, we are performing illocutionary acts (Searle 1969:16). Illocutionary acts are performed with intentionality.

According to Searle,

Speech act is a basic unit of a communication, it suggest that there are a series of a analytic connection between the notion of speech acts, what the speaker means, what the sentence uttered means, what the speaker intends, and what the hearer understands.
(Searle, 1969 as cited in Schiffrin, 1995:90)
Speech acts can be classified into three categories: locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act.

1. **Locutionary Act**: “The act of uttering a sentence or expression from a language; it is a description of what the speaker said and also the act of saying something in a full sense of ‘say’ (Coulthard, 1977:17). Levinson (1983:236) also added that locutionary act is the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference. For example: “I am sick Dad” the referring expression is ‘I’.

2. **Illocutionary Act**: “The making of a statement, offer, and promise, in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it (or with its explicit performative paraphrase) (Levinson, 1983:236). It means that every sentence which is produce by the speaker is followed by explicit or implicit meaning in which has a power (force) to give effect on the listener through the utterance. For example: the utterance “I swear to give it back next time” is used to perform the illocutionary acts of promising.

3. **Perlocutionary Act**: deals with the effect of illocutionary act which is focused on the listener. According to Levinson (1983:236) perlocutionary act is the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance. The speaker’s utterance can be included as perlocutionary act if the listener gives a response to the speaker utterances. For example: the utterance “There’s something in your shoulder!” may cause the listener to panic and to look on his shoulder. The perlocution of this utterance is to cause those emotion and action.

   In brief, if the listener to do something, automatically the speaker will say something (locutionary), then the speaker will act something to get what she or he wants (illocutionary). In contrast, the listener will do something as a response to the
speaker utterance (perlocutionary). Here are the examples to distinguish those types of speech acts.

- A speaker might say ‘There is a hornet in your left ear’ (locution), meaning “Be Careful!” (illocution), and the perlocutionary effect might be the hearer become panic, scream, or scratch his/her ear (Hurford and Heasley, 1984:243).

- A policeman says ‘Good evening, Sir. Do you live around here?’ (locution), meaning “Go inside your house because it is already late at night” (illocution). The perlocutionary effect might be the hearer becomes angry and says ‘It’s none of your business’ and walks on (Hurford and Heasley, 1984:244).

In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses a regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker’s intention, the attitude being expressed.

Although the focus of Speech Act Theory has been on utterances, especially those made in conversational and other face-to-face situations, the phrase ‘speech act’ should be taken as a generic term for any sort of language use, oral or otherwise.
2.2.2. Illocutionary Acts

According to Austin (1962) illocutionary act is the issuing of an utterance with conventional communicative force achieved ‘in saying’ (as cited in Schiffrin, 1995:51). Yule (1996:48) also added that illocutionary act is form an utterance with some kind of function in mind.

Hurford and Heasley state that

Illocutions are acts defined by social conventions, acts such as accosting, accusing, admitting, apologizing, challenging, complaining, condoling, congratulating, declining, deploring, giving permission, giving way, greeting, leavetaking, mocking, naming, offering, praising, promising, proposing marriage, protesting, recommending, surrendering, thanking, toasting.
(Hurford and Heasley, 1984:244)

This study will focus on Searle’s theory for this research. Searle proposes five macro classes of illocutionary acts. Those are (1) Directives (2) Commisives (3) Representative (4) Expressives, and (5) Declarations. According to Saeed (1997:212), Searle’s classification of illocutionary acts is based on some criteria:

1. Directives are the kinds of speech acts that the speaker uses to direct someone else to do something. It means that to reach the speaker wants, the speaker use others (hearers) to do it. Here, they do what the speaker wants. The acts can be requesting, questioning, commanding, pledging, inviting, and daring. For examples:
   - Please sit down!
   - Why don’t close the window?
   - Gimme a cup of coffee. Make it black.

2. Commisives are the kinds of speech acts which the speaker uses to commit himself to some future action. In this case, the speakers use themselves to get the purpose of their words. The act of this classification can appear in the
condition of promising, threatening, offering, guarantee, opposing, expecting, refusing and vowing. For examples:

- If you don’t stop fighting I’ll call the police.
- I’ll take you to the movies tomorrow.
- We will not do that.

3. Representatives are the kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Here, the statement can be defined as fact. The acts of this classification can be asserting, concluding, stating, telling, suggesting, swearing, claiming, reporting, comparing, and insisting. For examples:

- This is German car.
- The earth is flat.

4. Expressives are the kinds of speech acts which state that the speaker feels. It can be shown in the acts of thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating, deploring, condolence, greeting, and complaining. For examples:

- Let me express my thanks to the historic slate of candidates who accompanied me on this journey.
- Congratulations!
- I’m really sorry!

5. Declarations are the kinds of speech acts that change the world via utterances. It means that the acts of this kind of the utterance are used as an announcement, transforming from one condition to another. So, this part is being able to change the listeners’ point of view. This classification used in the case of declaring war, christening, marrying, and firing from employment.
For instance, ‘I pronounce you husband and wife’ (during the wedding ceremony), you’re out! (by referee).

These theories are used to classify the types of illocutionary acts so it can be clear differentiated deeper. The five classifications from Searle are the main theories to point each type of illocutionary acts in each utterance.

2.2.3. Types and Characteristics of Each Type of Speech

Speech is one of the forms of mass communication. Whitman and Boase (1983:297) say that speeches may be informative, persuasive and entertaining (as cited in Septiani, 1997:8-13)

**Informative speech** is the speech to inform. The purpose of the speech to inform is to lead the audience to have a clear and correct understanding of the problem, situation, event, concept or process about which the speaker chooses to speak. Moreover, it is more precise and definite in its aim to impart new, useful and fresh information. The following expression characterize the speech to inform

- *I would like to + say + (that)…*  
  *Saya akan mengatakan bahwa…*

  *tell you*  
  *memberitahukan*

  *inform*  
  *menginformasikan*

  *report*  
  *melaporkan*

  *communicate*  
  *menyampaikan*

  *make know*  
  *menyatakan*

  *notify*  
  *mengumumkan*

  *declare*  
  *menjelaskan*

  *proclaim*  
  *menggambarkan*
announce  menganalisa
explain  menurut para ahli
give a description  menunjuk pada peraturan
analyze  ada

- According to the researchers… Data
  menunjukkan bahwa…
- In accordance with the state ideology… Sesuai dengan ideology dasar…
- Referring to the rule of the game… Sesuai dengan peraturan…
- Further studies show us that… Penelitian menjelaskan…
- Our data confirm that… Data mengkonfirmasikan…
- The result of the recent suggested that… Penemuan baru mengusulkan…
- It has been reported in the previous pada study that… penelitian terdahulu…
- It is widely knows that… Kita ketahui bersama…
  recognized  Kita kenali bersama…
  acknowledged  Sepengetahuan kita…
- Generally speaking… Pada umumnya…
Next is persuasive speech. As rational and emotional beings, we are continually facing the condition in which we must persuade or be persuaded. We have to make decisions on many problems and issues that we face. Since men must think, feel, and act on every issue of life, public speakers, ministers, political candidates, and civil leaders tend to give persuasive speeches which will influence other people in beliefs, feelings and conduct. Although persuasive speaking is necessary, it must be emphasized that the speaker has a great moral obligation to use rather than to abuse his privileges in persuading people in their action and attitudes.

Oliver (1959:258) states that the speech persuasion is divided into three classes. The first is the speech to convince. The speech to convince attempts to change attitude, shift options or promote overt behavioral changes in the listeners. The following expressions characterize the speech to convince:

- I am convinced that...  
  Saya yakin bahwa...

- I believed (that)...  
  Saya percaya bahwa...

  think  
  pikir

  suppose  
  kira

  guess  
  duga

  presume  
  harap

  assume  
  tahu

  doubt  
  ragu

- I am sure that...  
  Saya yakin bahwa...

- It is a certain things that...  
  Hal ini sudah pasti...
There is no doubt…

The very thing is that...

It appears to me that...

I would firmly say that...

I am completely say that...

I feel very certain that...

To the best of my knowledge...

It is possible that...

It is likely that...

It is probably that...

The surest thing to consider seriously that...

We must now consider the possibility that...

The second is the speech to stimulate. It can be called as the speech to inspire or the speech to impress. The distinctively persuasive speech usually falls into one of two classes. The speech to stimulate falls in the later class. The speakers are not attempting to change beliefs or attitudes, but they are trying to impress the hearers with the important reasons. The characteristics of the speech to stimulate are;

I do hope that...

I am + hopeful + that...

optimistic about...

Saya berharap bahwa...

Ada alasan untuk percaya...

Saya.optimis bahwa...
an optimistic that... Saya berkeyakinan bahwa...

- I live in a hope that... Saya yakin bahwa...
- In the hope of arriving at a better life... Saya berharap untuk lebih baik
- There is reason to believe that... Ada alasan untuk percaya...
- I wish you good luck... Saya berharap anda beruntung..
- I hope you succeed... Saya berharap anda sukses...
- Let this illustration encourage you... Semoga ilustrasi ini mendorong anda...
- It is what I hope that you can... Ini yang saya harapkan...

And the third is the **speech to instruct**. The speech needs to concrete action from the audience. The action maybe based on conviction, evidence given, and conclusion. The action will come immediately after the close of the speech. The characteristics of the speech to instruct are;

- Shall we pray! Mari kita berdoa.
- Let me order you to... Saya ingin anda untuk...
- I would invite you... Saya mengundang anda...

  Advice you to... menyarankan...

  Recommend that you should... menyarankan...

- I want you to... Yang harus dilakukan adalah...
- Allow me to request you to... Itu ide yang bagus untuk...
- All we have to do is that... Semua yang harus dilakukan...
- We are obligate to... Kita wajib untuk...
- You don’t need to... Anda tidak perlu...
- You should have... Anda harus...
- It’s a good idea to... Merupakan ide yang bagus...
The last is **entertainment speech**. Like any other good speech, the one to entertain should contain a specific objective and the supporting material, organization and style to achieve the precise purpose. Entertainment speech usually uses humor, proverbs, wise words, poetic words, quotations, and figures of speech. The objective is to promote the audience relaxation and enjoyment. The characteristics the entertainment speeches are:

- **Man proposes, God disposes**  
  Manusia yang berencana, Tuhan yang menentukan

- **When there is a will, there is a way**  
  Ketika ada keinginan disitu ada jalan

- **A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush**  
  Sesuatu yang sudah pasti diperoleh lebih berharga daripada banyak hal yang belum pasti diperoleh

- **“The only thing to fear is fear itself”**  
  Ketakutan yang terbesar adalah ketakutan pada diri sendiri

- **“The liberty of the individual must not make himself a nuisance to other people”**  
  Kebebasan pribadi jangan sampai merugikan orang lain

### 2.2.4. Political Speech

Language is essential to politicians. Most activities performed by the politicians are done through the avenue created by language. Orwel (1946:154)
claimed that ‘in our age there is no keeping out of politics. All issues are political issues ... political language is in use all the time, all around us’ (Thomas and Wareing, 1999:32). Politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people’s behavior and often to control their values.

Power is quite an abstract concept, but an infinitely important influence on our lives. Moore and Hendry (1982:127) describe it as “the force in society that gets things done, and by studying it, we can identify who controls what, and for whose benefit” (Thomas and Wareing, 1999:10)

Power is often demonstrated through language; it is also actually achieved or ‘done’ through language. It might be possible to use language to manufacture an ideology which would steer the way people think. If we accept that the kind of language we use to represent something can alter the way in which it is perceived by people, then you might wonder whether by controlling discourse, one can control how another person thinks.

Spolsky (2008:58) claimed that language is regularly used in the exercise of political power. Politicians express their opinions and standpoints and present their arguments in order to influence and convince potential voters. They try to sound persuasive and look positive in front of their audience. Thomas and Wareing (1999:43) state that one of the challenges politician face is that they often have to talk about abstract concepts in ways that won’t bore people too much …figures of speech, therefore, have several important functions in political language. They help make abstract ideas easier to think about and they are ideologically powerful since they often link with experiences about which we have strong feelings.
One of activities in speech act is by doing a speech. According to Beard (2000:45) in Nugroho (2011:10), a politician will usually use the first person singular as I/me/myself/mine or the first person plural such as we/us/ourselves/ours in producing his speech. Here stated there are advantages by doing so. Using the first person singular can “show the clear sense of personal involvement on the part of the speaker, which is especially useful when good news is delivered.” Furthermore, the advantage of using plural form is to share responsibilities, “especially when his decisions are tricky, when the news is uncertain.”

Thomas and Wareing (1999:45) added that the way a political speaker refers to themselves and to their audience can also be a very significant. The pronouns applied to the speaker, to their allegiances and to the audience can be used to foreground or hide agency …and responsibility, depending on what the politician is talking about.

When delimiting political discourse, it is important to stress that it takes the form of - institutional discourse (Van Dijk 2001:6). This means that only those discourses of politicians are considered that are produced in institutional settings, such as governments, parliaments or political parties.... The discourse must be produced by the speaker in her professional role of a politician and in an institutional setting (2001:6). In addition, discourse is political when it accomplishes a political act in a political institution, such as governing, legislation, electoral campaigning, and so on (2001:6).

Political speech is definitely not categorized into the speech of entertaining, which made this research only concentrated in the persuasive speeches. The goal of persuasive speech is to influence other people in beliefs, feelings and conduct. Based
on speech classification from Whitman and Boase, it can be assumed that Joko Widodo used persuasive speech style in his political speeches.